

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-25 in the application. The Applicant has amended Claim 25. No other claims have been amended, canceled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-25 are currently pending in the application.

### **I. Formal Matters and Objections**

The Examiner has objected to Claim 25 for using "comprises" instead of "comprising." In response, the Applicant has amended Claim 25 to correct this informality. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this objection of Claim 25 and allow issuance thereof.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,721,720 to Skanning, *et al.* In response to the Examiner's reliance on Skanning, the Applicant submits herewith an Affidavit of the inventor under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 with a true and correct copy of an invention submission form submitted as Exhibit A. The Affidavit and Exhibit A conclusively provide evidence that establishes the present invention was conceived prior to the filing date of Skanning (February 22, 2001) and that information necessary for the subsequent filing of the present Application was diligently prepared and filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office. As a result, Skanning is antedated by the present invention. Thus, Skanning is not a proper prior art reference and does not anticipate Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-18

and 20-21. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection with respect to these claims.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skanning. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, however, since Skanning is not a prior art reference, as discussed in detail above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection of dependent Claims 8-9 and allow issuance thereof.

### **IV. Rejection of Claims 11-14 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 11-14 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skanning in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,939,925 to Shibata, *et al.* Skanning has been cited to teach each element of independent Claims 1 and 15. As discussed above, however, Skanning is not a prior art reference.

Shibata has not been cited to teach each element of independent Claims 1 and 15 but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claims 11-14 and 22-25. Shibata is directed to provide a semiconductor operational circuit which is capable of conducting calculations with respect to analog vectors at high speed and with high accuracy. (*See* column 1, lines 59-63.) The cited combination, therefore, of Skanning and Shibata does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claims 1 and 15 and Claims 11-14 and 22-25 which depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103 rejection of dependent Claims 11-14 and 22-25 and allow issuance thereof.


**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-25.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



J. Joel Justiss

Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 10/13/64

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800